



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MISCELLANY.

---

### THIRD CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SOCIOLOGY, HELD AT PARIS, JULY 21-24, 1897.

After holding at Paris its first two congresses in 1894 and 1895, the International Institute of Sociology decided not to hold a reunion in 1896, in order not to discourage its members by demanding of them too great an effort to sustain these gatherings, and in order to insure the greater success of the congress which it was proposed to hold in 1897. Subsequent events proved the wisdom of this decision, because the reunion which has just been held has been productive of the most happy results. From the moment of its opening the congress was pronounced a singular success. It was held at the Sorbonne. In accordance with the hospitable permission of the eminent authorities of the University, a hall of the Faculty of Science was placed at our disposal, and we had the honor of assembling in a place made sacred by the glorious traditions of scientific research and of higher education.

The President of the International Institute of Sociology for 1897, M. Paul de Lilienfeld, Senator of the Russian Empire, came from St. Petersburg in order to preside at the congress. He opened the session on Wednesday, July 21, at three o'clock in the afternoon. Seated around him on the platform were M. A. Espinas, Vice-President of the International Institute; MM. J. Novicow and G. Tarde, former vice-presidents, and the General Secretary. Twenty-one members or associates of the Institute were present. They were, besides those already named, MM. R. Garofalo, N. Karéief, Achille Loria, L. Manouvrier, C. N. Starcke, L. Stein, S. R. Steinmetz and Emile Worms, members; and MM. O. d'Araujo, A. Bonnet, Ad. Coste, H. Decugis, C. de Krauz, Alfred Lambert, Ch. Limousin and H. Monin, associates. Besides these, MM. Fr. Giner de los Rios, Vice-President; P. Dorado and Lester Ward, members; F. Puglia and R. de la Grasserie, associates of the Institute, sent written communications. About one hundred and fifty persons, of whom many were members of various learned societies and a certain number students, attended the first session.

This session comprised in the first place, following the usage of each congress, the opening address by the President and a reply by the General Secretary. Then, M. Ludwig Stein, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Berne, read an article treating of the definition of sociology. In conclusion, M. le Baron R. Garofalo, chief of the legislative department in the Italian Ministry of Justice, gave a résumé of a study entitled "The Individual Brain and the Social Brain," which was vigorously discussed by MM. Limousin, de Krauz, Monin, Tarde, Novicow and the author of the paper.

On the following morning, July 22, at nine o'clock, the two most extensive papers submitted to the congress were read. One, presented in the name of M. Lester Ward, of the Columbian University of Washington, was entitled "Pain and Pleasure Economy," which called forth remarks from MM. Novicow and Espinas. The other related to "The Sociological Importance of Economic Studies of the Colonies," and was presented by M. Achille Loria, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Padua. This paper was discussed by MM. René Worms, Monin, Steinmetz, to whom M. Loria replied.

In the afternoon of the same day, at two o'clock, a debate was opened on a topic which was expected to be the chief theme of the congress: "The Organic Theory of Society." One fact is worthy of remark; instantly this question assumed unexpected dimensions. At our first congress, each speaker was at liberty to choose his topic; at the second, five principal topics of discussion were fixed in advance; for the third, the same liberty as obtained at the first congress was granted. But it was found that in the natural tendency of things the discussions were brought to bear on one central point. From the first day the papers and speeches constantly brought up for examination the organic theory. It commenced officially Thursday evening. M. J. Novicow from Odessa read a paper favoring this theory. Following this there was a paper by the President, M. de Lilienfeld, who based on the same principles a system of graphical representation of social phenomena. M. G. Tarde attacked the conclusions of his two colleagues, and presented in opposition to the organic theory a psychological theory of social life. These various speakers having held the attention of those present during the four hours' session, a continuation of the discussion was placed on the program for the following afternoon.

Friday, July 23, at two o'clock in the afternoon, M. le Baron Casimir de Krauz attacked the organic theory and defended as opposed to it a theory of economic materialism. M. L. Stein agreed with the critics

of the organic theory and presented the principles of the historic and psychogenetic method of research. The present writer, on the contrary, tried to show something of the exactness and utility of the analogy between organisms and society. M. S. R. Steinmetz, Privatdozent at the University of Utrecht, vigorously opposed this analogy. M. C. N. Starcke, Privatdozent at the University of Copenhagen; M. le Baron Garofalo, M. Ch. Limousin each in turn made various reservations in their acceptance of the organic theory. M. N. Karéief, Professor at the University of St. Petersburg, showed that this theory shared, together with Darwin's social theory, economic materialism and social psychic theories, the fate of all exclusive theories. Professor Espinas, of the Sorbonne, said that in order to solve the question it was necessary to make a distinction between organisms in general and *blastodèmes*, living beings which possess vascular communication between their parts. Societies are not *blastodèmes*; but it is necessary to maintain that they constitute organisms if one does not wish to abandon altogether the idea of social life and social laws. Following MM. Tarde, de Krauz and Stein, M. Novicow again took up the discussion and endeavored to show that the arguments of his adversaries had not undermined his conviction in favor of the organic theory.

This memorable debate was closed after having occupied two afternoons, in which the ardor of the vigorous champions of diverse doctrines had been uninterruptedly sustained by the rare attention of a remarkably well informed and serious audience. We can say truly that the most widely varying opinions were freely expressed and brought forward by representatives well authorized to speak for the different points of view. Without doubt it is not possible to propose a solution which will find acceptance on all sides, but at least this collection of ideas and opinions constitutes the most complete discussion which exists on this question, and henceforth anyone who wishes to treat the problem profoundly in its different aspects will have to consult the volume which will appear containing these proceedings.

In order to give a consecutive account of this controversial debate we omitted to speak of a session which intervened, namely, that of Friday morning, the twenty-third of July. Three technical papers were read; one by M. Starcke, upon "The Laws of Political Evolution;" the second by M. Steinmetz, upon "Corollary Selection;" the last by M. Raoul de la Grasserie, upon "The Evolution of the Idea of Monarchy."

Saturday, July 24, was the last day of the congress. Its two sessions were well attended. In the morning we listened to a report

by M. Pedro Dorado, Professor of Criminal Law at the University of Salamanca, treating of the future mission of criminal justice. This paper was discussed by MM. F. Puglia, René Worms, de Krauz, Novicow, de Lilienfeld, d'Araujo and Espinas. Following this there was a communication from M. Alfred Lambert upon "The Social Obligation for Relief," which called forth some discussion from MM. Emile Worms, Limousin, Stein, and a reply by the author.

In the afternoon we listened to a paper on "Experiment in Sociology" and to a résumé of several other papers which were not presented by the authors in person. After a few closing remarks by the General Secretary and the President the congress was declared closed. A business session of the officers of the Institute was held immediately after, at which time it was decided to hold a congress in Paris in 1900, and to empower the Executive Committee to convoke another congress in the meantime in some other city if circumstances seem to demand it. The election of members for the executive committees for the succeeding years was then provided for and it was decided that at the next congress two main questions would be submitted for discussion, namely, the question of the clan, and, secondly, of economic materialism. Some minor changes were made in the organization of the Institute and some new associates of the Institute were elected.

Such was then in brief the third congress. An eminent Russian sociologist who had been present at the two preceding congresses, M. Novicow, said that in his opinion it was the most animated and brilliant of the three. We have been able in this brief and impersonal report only to mention the names of the speakers and the subjects of their papers. Within a few months the fourth volume of the Annals of the International Institute of Sociology, which will contain the papers and discussions of this congress, will be issued, and we hope in this way that those who were not able to be present at the congress will be able to share in its results and will be convinced of the fact that its labors have contributed to the advancement of social science.

RÉNÉ WORMS.

*Paris.*

(Translated by Samuel McCune Lindsay.)